

By Mr. WELLSTONE:

S. 2348. A bill to provide for fairness and accuracy in student testing; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 2349. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to permit States with proven cost-effective and efficient child support collection systems to continue to operate such systems; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 2350. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to certain water rights to Duchesne City, Utah; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 2351. A bill to provide for the settlement of the water rights claims of the Shivwits Band of the Paiute Indian tribe of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

S. 2352. A bill to designate portions of the Wekiva River and associated tributaries as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. INOUE, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. STEVENS):

S. 2353. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the program for American Indian Tribal Colleges and Universities under part A of title III; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROTH (for himself and Mr. MOYNIHAN):

S. 2354. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent the duplication of losses through the assumption of liabilities giving rise to a deduction; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SANTORUM:

S. 2355. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to modify authorizations of appropriations for programs under such Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LUGAR (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 2356. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve management of the child and adult care food program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. Con. Res. 102. A concurrent resolution to commend the bravery and honor of the citizens of Remy, France, for their actions with respect to Lieutenant Houston Braly and to recognize the efforts of the 364th Fighter Group to raise funds to restore the stained glass windows of a church in Remy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MURKOWSKI (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 2343. A bill to amend the National Historic Preservation Act for the pur-

poses of establishing a national historic lighthouse preservation program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LIGHTHOUSE PRESERVATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, with my colleague from Michigan, I am proud to introduce the National Lighthouse Preservation Act of 2000. This bill would amend the National Historic Preservation Act to establish a historic lighthouse preservation program within the Department of the Interior. It is similar to a bill that the Senate passed in the 105th Congress.

The legislation directs the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services to establish a process for conveying historic lighthouses which are around our coastal areas and Great Lakes when these lighthouses have been deemed to be in excess of Federal needs of the agency owning and operating the lighthouse. For entities eligible to receive a historic lighthouse, it would be for the uses of educational, park, recreation, cultural, and historic preservation. And the agencies that would be included would be Federal or State agencies, local governments, nonprofit corporations, educational agencies, and community development organizations, and so forth.

There is no question that the historic lighthouses would be conveyed in a nonfee structure to selected entities which would have the obligation to maintain the integrity of these historic structures.

The historic lighthouses would revert back to the United States if a property ceases to be used for education, park, recreation, cultural or historic preservation purposes, or failed to be maintained in compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act.

Lighthouses are among the most romantic reminders of our country's maritime heritage. Marking dangerous headlands, shoals, bars, and reefs, these structures played a vital role in indicating navigable waters and supporting this Nation's maritime transportation and commerce. These lighthouses served the needs of the early mariners who navigated by visual sightings on landmarks, coastal lights, and the heavens. Hundreds of lighthouses have been built along our sea coasts and on the Great Lakes, creating the world's most complex aids to navigation system. No other national lighthouse system compares with that of the United States in size and diversity of architectural and engineering types.

My legislation pays tribute to this legacy and establishes a process which will ensure the protection and maintenance of these historical lighthouses so that future generations of Americans will be able to appreciate these treasured landmarks.

The legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Department of the Inte-

rior, through the National Park Service, to establish a historic lighthouse preservation program. The Secretary is charged with collecting and sharing information on historic lighthouses; conducting educational programs to inform the public about the contribution to society of historic lighthouses; and maintaining an inventory of historic lighthouses.

A historic light station is defined as a lighthouse, and surrounding property, at least 50 years old, which has been evaluated for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places, and included in the Secretary's listing of historic light stations.

Most important, the Secretary, in conjunction with the Administrator of General Services, is to establish a process for identifying, and selecting among eligible entities to which a historic lighthouse could be conveyed. Eligible entities will include Federal agencies, State agencies, local communities, nonprofit corporations, and educational and community development organizations financially able to maintain a historic lighthouse, including conformance with the National Historic Preservation Act. When a historic lighthouse has been deemed excess to the needs of the Federal agency which manages the lighthouse, the General Services Administration will convey it, for free, to a selected entity for education, park, recreation, cultural, and historic preservation purposes.

My legislation also recognizes the value of lighthouse friends groups. Often, these groups have spent significant time and resources on preserving the character of historic lighthouses only to have this work go to waste when the lighthouse is transferred out of Federal ownership. Under current General Services Administration regulations, these friends groups are last on the priority list to receive a surplus light station in spite of their efforts to protect it. My bill gives priority consideration to public entities who submit applications in which the public entity partners with a nonprofit friends group.

Everyone agrees that the historic character of these lighthouses needs to be maintained. But the cost of maintaining these historic structures is becoming increasingly high for Federal agencies in these times of tight budgetary constraints. These lighthouses were built in an age when they had to be manned continuously. Today's advanced technology makes it possible to build automated aids to navigation that do not require around-the-clock manning. This technology has made many of these historic lighthouses expensive anachronisms which Federal agencies must maintain even if they no longer use them as navigational aids.

My legislation ensures that the historic character of these lighthouses are maintained when the lighthouses are

no longer needed by the Federal Government. When the historic lighthouse is conveyed out of Federal ownership, the entity which receives the lighthouse must maintain it in accordance with historic preservation laws and standards. A lighthouse would revert to the United States, at the option of the General Services Administration, if the lighthouse is not being used or maintained as required by the law.

In the event no government agency or nonprofit organization is approved to receive a historic lighthouse, it would be offered for sale by the General Services Administration. The proceeds from these sales would be transferred to the National Maritime Heritage Grant Program within the National Park Service. Congress established the National Maritime Heritage Grant Program in 1994 to provide grants for maritime heritage preservation and education projects. Unfortunately, funding for this program has been nonexistent so the proceeds from any historic lighthouse sales would help ensure the program's viability.

It is my intent to ensure that coastal towns, where a historic lighthouse is an integral part of the community, would receive a historic lighthouse when it is no longer needed by the Federal Government. These historic lighthouses could be used by the community as a local park, a community center, or a tourist bureau. It also would ensure that historic lighthouse friends groups or lighthouse preservation societies, which have voluntarily helped to maintain the historic character of the lighthouse, could receive an excess lighthouse.

Mr. President, I know firsthand the importance and allure of these historic lighthouses. When I was in the Coast Guard, I helped maintain lighthouses and other navigational aids. These lights were critical to safe maritime traffic and I took my responsibilities seriously knowing that lives were dependent on it.

By preserving historic lighthouses, we preserve a symbol of that era in American history when maritime traffic was the lifeblood of the Nation, tying isolated coastal towns through trade to distant ports around the world. Hundreds of historic lighthouses are owned by the Federal Government and many of these are difficult and expensive to maintain. This legislation provides a process to ensure that these historic lighthouses are maintained and publicly accessible.

I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor the National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act. Michigan is second only to Alaska in length of shoreline. However, Michigan is second to none in the number of lighthouses which grace its shores. Michigan has over 120 lighthouses. As

such, it is most appropriate indeed that I work with my friend and colleague from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, in introducing this legislation.

For centuries our nation's lighthouses have served as beacons to mariners guiding them on their journeys. Due to recent navigational advances, these lights often no longer serve the noble purpose for which they were built. The current custodian of many of these lights, the United States Coast Guard, has neither the funding nor manpower to maintain these majestic lights. This act will help ensure proper stewards are found for these American Castles, thus ensuring they will remain cultural beacons for generations to come.

Over the next 10 years the U.S. Coast Guard has said it will be transferring from its ownership at least 70 of Michigan's historic lighthouses. I have been working with the Michigan Lighthouse Project to identify future custodians of these lighthouses. This legislation is essential to facilitate the transfer of the Michigan lighthouses and other lighthouses around the country. Currently, through the existing government transfer process, there is no way to easily transfer lighthouses to nonprofit historical societies. This legislation sets up an expedited GSA process allowing lighthouses to be transferred by the government directly to nonprofit historical organizations.

This legislation is needed to allow for and facilitate the transfers of these lighthouses to nonprofit historical organizations who will preserve and care for them and keep them in the "public domain" where they can be enjoyed by all, once they are transferred.

Last Congress I cosponsored a similar bill which passed the Senate but died in a House Committee. This Congress, we have worked with all the Federal agencies involved with lighthouse transfers as well as with the Great Lakes Lighthouse Keepers Association to develop this slightly modified bill.

I hope the National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act will be enacted quickly so that we can begin the orderly and timely process of transferring our treasured historic lighthouses to the appropriate historical institutions that will care for them and make them accessible to the public.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 2347. A bill to provide grants to partnerships to establish and carry out information technology training programs and to provide incentives for educators to obtain information technology certification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACT OF 2000

• Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, in the past decade, the United States has experienced unparalleled economic growth. Unemployment has been low, inflation has not been a major concern and job opportunities for college graduates and many other U.S. workers have been plentiful. In so small measure, this economic achievement has been the result of the extraordinary growth and opportunities provided by the high tech industry.

According to the most recent information from the American Electronics Association (AEA), the high technology industry has added more than 1 million jobs to the U.S. economy between 1993 and 1998. High tech employment has soared from 3.9 million jobs in 1993 to more than 4.8 million jobs in 1998. The industry is one of the fastest growing segments of the U.S. economy.

In North Dakota, growth in high technology, particularly in software and computer-related services, has tracked U.S. high tech expansion. Information from the American Electronics Association shows that North Dakota was one of the few states that led the nation in the percentage of high-tech employment growth. Between 1990 and 1997, North Dakota almost doubled its high tech employment from 2,800 to 5,300 workers, a growth rate of 91 percent.

Despite this extraordinary growth in the high tech industry over the past decade, and trends which indicate that the high-tech industry will continue to be among the fastest growing job segments in the 21st century, one of the biggest challenges of the high-tech industry is ensuring an adequate supply of skilled IT workers.

In 1997, the Department of Commerce and the Information Technology Association of America (ITAA) reported on the critical shortage of skilled high-tech workers in the U.S. The ITAA released a study which estimated the current shortage of skilled workers in various information technology fields at more than 340,000. Moreover, the Department of Labor projected that our economy would require more than 130,000 jobs in information technology—systems analysts, computer scientists, and engineers—annually for the next 10 years.

Mr. President, during the closing days of the 105th Congress, the Senate took the first steps to respond to the IT worker shortage by voting to increase the annual cap on H1B visas. This increase, which I supported, enables foreign workers to be employed in the U.S. high-tech industry.

During this debate on H1B visas and the IT worker shortage, I introduced legislation to encourage IT training partnerships between the private sector and education communities as another option for responding to the worker shortage.

Now, as the Senate returns for the 2d Session of the 106th Congress, and as projections for the IT worker shortage are increasing, the Senate will consider legislation to raise the cap on H1B visas beyond the increase approved in 1998. There are few proposals, however, to authorize significant incentives to encourage IT training for American workers. In 1998, we authorized only a small amount of funding for IT training and education from the fees collected under the H1B expansion.

There is no question that recruitment of skilled foreign workers is very important for the IT industry. Indeed, it will be necessary to increase that cap again before adjournment of the 106th Congress. Increasing the H1B visa cap alone, however, will not solve the IT worker shortage.

Congress must also examine longer term solutions to encourage the expansion of IT training and education. Many key firms, including Cisco Systems, Texas Instruments, Microsoft, EDS, Lucent and IBM, are currently providing excellent training and educational opportunities in IT. These firms are also encouraging individuals of all ages to think about career opportunities in information technology. But, without question, the demand for IT workers is growing, and raising the H1B cap by itself will not provide the skilled IT work force that is necessary in the coming decade.

Following up my initiative in the 106th Congress to authorize a tax credit for information technology training, S. 456, I am introducing the Information Technology Act of 2000 to provide additional incentives for IT training and education partnerships. I am very pleased that Senators REID, JOHNSON, LEVIN, KENNEDY, LINCOLN, BAYH, and ROCKEFELLER are joining as original cosponsors of this legislation.

The Information Technology Act of 2000 would authorize \$100 million in FY 2001 in matching Federal funds through the Departments of Education and Labor to encourage IT training partnerships between the education community and private sector. The education partnerships would encourage IT training for those individuals that are the most underrepresented in the information technology field—dislocated workers, women, veterans, senior citizens, the Native American communities and students who have not completed their high school education.

Additionally, my legislation would help teachers improve their information technology teaching skills by authorizing a \$5,000 bonus for educators who become certified in one or more information technology skills including integrating technology into the classroom. \$100 million would be authorized annually for this program for five years beginning in FY 2001.

Currently, the Department of Education, through a number of profes-

sional development programs including the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, offers educators a number of opportunities for training to integrate technology into school classrooms.

But according to the National Center for Education Statistics, only 20 percent of full-time public school teachers believe that they are well prepared to integrate technology into the classroom. Approximately 79 percent of teachers believe that they do not get enough help in preparing to use technology in the classroom.

The need for this technology training was also underscored in a recent survey of educators by Education Week. Highlights of this survey regarding teacher's training were reported in a Washington Post article on March 18, 2000. Clearly, teachers should be offered more opportunities for information technology training.

Mr. President, as the Senate considers options to respond to the IT worker shortage, several pending measures, including raising the H1B cap, reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and tax relief legislation will provide excellent opportunities to establish a comprehensive IT worker shortage policy.

I urge my colleagues to work together during the remaining days of the 106th Congress and support a package of IT worker shortage initiatives that will help American firms not only maintain their competitive edge in the world market, but enable Americans who are not now part of the IT expansion to have that opportunity. I welcome cosponsors of the Information Technology Act of 2000. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this legislation and the article entitled "Teachers Online but Disconnected," from the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2347

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Information Technology Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **CERTIFIED COMMERCIAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TRAINING PROVIDER.**—The term "certified commercial information technology training provider" means a private sector provider of educational products and services utilized for training in information technology that is certified with respect to—

(A) the curriculum that is used for the training; or

(B) the technical knowledge of the instructors of such provider,

by 1 or more software publishers or hardware manufacturers the products of which are a subject of the training.

(2) **DISLOCATED WORKER.**—The term "dislocated worker" has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801).

(3) **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY CERTIFICATION.**—The term "information technology certification" means certification in information technology, in accordance with such standards as—

(A)(i) the Computing Technology Industry Association, the Information Technology Training Association, the International Society for Technology in Education, or another information technology professional association may issue, after consultation with chief education officers of States, State boards and entities that certify or license teachers, and other entities impacted by the standards; or

(ii) a State board or entity that certifies or licenses teachers may issue, after consultation with chief education officers of States, and other entities impacted by the standards; and

(B) the Secretaries may approve.

(4) **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TRAINING PROGRAM.**—The term "information technology training program" means a program for the training of—

(A) computer programmers, systems analysts, and computer scientists or engineers (as such occupations are defined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics); and

(B) persons for such other occupations as are determined to be appropriate by the Secretaries, after consultation with a working group broadly solicited by the Secretaries and open to all interested information technology entities and trade and professional associations.

(5) **INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002).

(6) **NATIVE AMERICAN.**—The term "Native American" means an Indian or a Native Hawaiian, as defined in section 166(a) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2911(a)).

(7) **SECRETARIES.**—The term "Secretaries" means the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Labor, acting jointly.

(8) **VETERAN.**—The term "veteran" has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801).

SEC. 3. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TRAINING PROGRAM GRANTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretaries may make grants to eligible partnerships to pay for the Federal share of the cost of establishing and carrying out information technology training programs for minorities, women, older individuals, veterans, Native Americans, dislocated workers, and former participants in information technology training programs who have not received information technology certification.

(b) **PARTNERSHIPS.**—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a), a partnership shall consist of—

(1) an institution of higher education; and

(2) a private organization, such as a certified commercial information technology training provider or an information technology trade or professional association.

(c) **APPLICATION.**—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a), a partnership shall submit an application to the Secretaries at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretaries may require.

(d) **FEDERAL SHARE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Federal share of the cost described in subsection (a) shall be 50 percent.

(2) **NON-FEDERAL SHARE.**—The non-Federal share of the cost shall be provided in cash or

in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 and such sums as may be necessary for each subsequent fiscal year.

SEC. 4. BONUS GRANTS FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY CERTIFICATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Education may make grants to appropriate organizations, to assist the organizations in awarding bonuses to teachers who achieve information technology certification.

(b) **AMOUNT.**—Subject to the availability of appropriations under subsection (d), the Secretary of Education shall award a grant to an organization under subsection (a) in an amount not greater than the product of \$5,000 and the number of teachers described in subsection (c)(2).

(c) **APPLICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a local educational agency shall submit an application to the Secretary of Education at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—At a minimum, the application shall contain information describing the number of teachers that—

(A) have achieved information technology certification, including such certification for integrating information technology into the classroom and a curriculum;

(B) have not previously received awards under this section; and

(C) have entered into agreements with the agency to continue to teach for the agency for periods of not less than 3 years, after receiving bonuses under this section.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

[From the Washington Post, Sat., Mar. 18, 2000]

TEACHERS ONLINE BUT DISCONNECTED

(By Liz Seymour)

At Sanders Corner Elementary School in Loudoun County, the computer has become a teaching tool almost as basic as the textbook or the blackboard.

In third-grade science class, students have created a database to distinguish between terrestrial and aquatic animals. In fourth-grade social studies, classes explore the Web to learn about American Colonial history. In English classes in various grades, children write stories on computers and turn them into a multimedia presentation.

But what's routine at Sanders Corner is not at all typical at Jermantown Elementary School in Fairfax County. Although Jermantown has plenty of computers, its teachers say they don't know enough to take full advantage of them.

Sixth-grade teacher Eric Fleming, for example, would love to convert his students' weekly newspaper into a classroom-designed Web site where parents could see what their children had learned each day. The school's hardware and software are capable of such an effort, but he isn't. "That's all well beyond me," said Fleming, considered one of Jermantown's most computer-fluent instructors. "I need someone to teach me how to do this."

Contrasts like the one between Sanders Corner and Jermantown—both in affluent school districts—turn up many times across the Washington suburbs, and sometimes exist within the same school. Some class-

rooms use computers constantly, while others rarely incorporate them into daily activities.

It is a digital divide that often has little to do with a school's supply of technology equipment; Sanders Corner has 4.4 students per computer, as does Jermantown. Nor is it necessarily a question of how much formal training a school's teachers have received.

Teachers and school officials say the gap instead boils down to the fact that some teachers are getting far more help than others in building on what they learned in technology training class. And some teachers are more motivated than others to seek such help in the first place.

Some schools, like Sanders Corner, have a full-time technology specialist who is regularly giving teachers ideas on how to use computers to enliven their lessons; many others, like Jermantown, have to share that person with other schools.

Even at a school with its own technology coach, it is ultimately up to each classroom teacher to make the effort to plan a computer-centered lesson or project. And patience, enthusiasm, learning curve and planning time can vary enormously from one teacher to another.

"There are some teachers out there who are extraordinary. They pretty much taught themselves," said Linda G. Roberts, director of educational technology at the U.S. Department of Education. "Another group is using some of the resources but is easily discouraged . . . Most teachers want to learn, but they say it takes time and they need help."

The result is that the impact of computers on instruction continues to lag behind their presence in schools, both in the Washington area and nationwide. More than 95 percent of schools and nearly two-thirds of classrooms have computers connected to the Internet. Yet in a recent survey by the National Center for Education Statistics, 79 percent of teachers said they don't get enough help using technology in the classroom. Another poll, by Education Week magazine, found that only 50 percent of teachers support lessons with computer software.

Educators and business leaders worry that the inconsistencies threaten the popular notion that the nation's billion-dollar investment in hardware and software will lead to better learning for schoolchildren.

"We're not seeing the professional development at the level that we'd like, and there is not the integration of technology day in and day out that we'd like to see," said June Streckfus, executive director of the Maryland Business Roundtable, a nonprofit group of business leaders that is monitoring computer use in Maryland schools.

School administrators generally do not measure how well or how often teachers use classroom technology. Nor have schools developed guidelines on what role computers should play in the curriculum, either by academic subject or by grade level. Some school systems, such as Montgomery County, have started posting technology ideas for teachers on their Web sites, and some schools are cataloguing technology resources for class instruction.

There is no consensus among educators on how much computers benefit the learning process. But teachers who use them often in their classes say that Web browsing and educational software usually increase students' interest in a topic and sometimes trigger understanding when either teaching methods have failed.

"It's such a part of our lives," said Susan Jones, a fifth-grade teacher at Sanders Cor-

ner who constantly includes technology in her lessons. "Any way I can do it, I will."

Jones recently posed this question to her fifth-grade history class: Did Patrick Henry really commit such a heinous act as treason?

The lights went off and the Web site of Henry's last home and burial place, www.redhill.org, was projected onto a screen dangling from the black-board. Browsing the site spurred a debate among the students about Henry's motives in challenging England.

When they studied Benjamin Franklin, Jones's fifth-graders e-mailed a Web site on Franklin and got responses as if they were written by the historical figure. They also took a virtual tour of Colonial Williamsburg on www.history.org.

Jones and other teachers at Sanders Corner say they get a huge boost from having someone at the school all day whose sole job is to help them blend technology with instruction.

That person is Kathy Hayden, a technology resource teacher since 1995. Hayden was a fourth-grade instructor in Loudoun who loved using computers in class. School staff members say her advice carries weight because she truly understands a classroom teacher's job.

At Sanders Corner, Hayden started "Tech Tuesday," a weekly training session that rotates among small groups of teachers with common interests or skills. She also attends planning meetings of same-grade teachers. Some-times she will teach a lesson with a classroom instructor who is shy about using computers.

Ricki Fellows had been teaching for 23 years but rarely used computers with her students until she arrived at Sanders Corner last fall and got some coaching from Hayden. "I had some mixed feelings about it," Fellows said. "It was really fear of the unknown."

Now, that fear is gone. Recently Fellows's third-graders went on a field trip to the Smithsonian Institution. With a digital camera, she snapped photos of Egyptian art for social studies class, and rocks and minerals for science. Back in class, the students downloaded the film, selected photos, and wrote and edited essays on their computers about what they had seen at the museum.

"I really am excited again about teaching," Fellows said. "I'm learning and I'm growing—that's what it's all about."

The Maryland Business Roundtable has urged school districts to put a full-time technology specialist in every school. Loudoun already does that, but most Washington area districts don't.

"After you're trained, you can't ask anyone any questions," said Ann Mallon, a first-grade teacher at Jermantown Elementary, which shares a technology specialist with six other schools, the typical ratio in Fairfax County's school system. "When we don't have a person here, we stop using the programs."

Fairfax school officials have proposed spending \$4 million to hire an additional 114 technology specialists, so that each would be assigned to no more than two schools.

But even teachers who have regular access to an expert coach say they don't get enough planning time to develop computer-based lessons. In many cases, teachers say, they spend hours on their home computers rummaging for Web sites.

In coming weeks, Kim Price will teach meteorology to her fourth-graders at Fairfax's Crossfield Elementary by having them create a weather map based on data they find

on the Web. "This is the coolest thing I've ever done," she said.

It also took her an entire school day and about three hours on her computer at home to develop the project and write the instructions on a specially designed Web site.

"This is one of the problems," said Price, whose school has a part-time specialist. "It takes hours to do anything worthwhile. If you have a half-hour to 45 minutes in any one block of planning time, that's not enough."

More planning time must be built into teachers' schedules, at least until they acquire more hands-on experience with their computers, said Roberts, the U.S. Department of Education official.

As for the formal computer training their school systems provide, most of the teachers interviewed said it is usually just a few hours at the beginning of the school year and covers only the basics.

Patrick F. Chorprenning Jr., who teaches government at Fairfax's West Potomac High School, says he seldom bothers to take such courses. Chorprenning acquired his technology know-how during his former career as a business executive, and he says he has learned on his own how to use computers in his classes.

He projects Web sites in his classroom to illustrate various points about today's politics, and he gives students lists of sites to peruse and assigns them to report back on what they find.

Education officials and business leaders say making computers a more standard part of instruction will require more spending on teacher training and tougher standards for technology competency.

Virginia has established teacher competency standards in technology, although they are not related to a teacher's recertification. Maryland has no such requirements.

Business executives also have urged teacher colleges to assess whether they are giving students enough technology advice. Surveys have shown that even recent graduates of such programs, who were raised with computers, are poorly prepared to use them in class.

At Jermantown Elementary, teachers' computer literacy is likely to be higher next year. Because it is merging with another school and is being designated a "focus school" for communications and art, Jermantown will get three full-time technology specialists, as well as more computers.

"A whole new world will open up," said Susan D. Kane, the school's principal. "You can see where they're at now—where you do what you can and you hope for the best."•

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator CONRAD and Senator REID in introducing the Information Technology Act. The dual goal of this legislation is to ensure that every teacher in America has the ability to integrate technology into the classroom and the curriculum; and to train our citizens to meet the demand for the thousands of jobs that will need to be filled in the next decade.

Mr. President, our legislation establishes two initiatives that are aimed at achieving these goals. First, it authorizes \$100 million for the creation of a Teacher Tech Bonus in the amount of \$5,000. The bonuses will be awarded to teachers who successfully train and receive certification in the use of tech-

nology in the classroom and in the curriculum, or teachers who become certified to teach courses in computer technology. Bonuses would be provided by the U.S. Department of Education through grants to Local Education Agencies (LEA). As a condition for receipt of bonuses, teachers are required to enter into agreements with their LEA to continue to teach within that LEA for periods of not less than three years, and such other requirements as established by the Secretary. This provision of the Information Technology Act is essential, if we are going to realize the full potential of our investment in new technology in the classroom. So few of our school districts have been able to offer state-of-the-art training, or any training at all for that matter, to their teaching staff. Students today are in the midst of a technology explosion that has opened up limitless possibilities in the classroom. In order for them to tap into this potential and be prepared for the jobs of the 21st century, they must learn how to use new technologies. But all too often, teachers are expected to incorporate technology into their instruction without being given the training to do so. It is not enough for teachers to be able to email or use computers to keep attendance or grade their students, they must use this education technology to advance their curriculum. According to a recent survey by the National Center for Education Statistics, 79 percent of teachers said they do not get enough help using technology in the classroom. Last year, a report by Education Week's National Survey of Teachers' Use of Digital Content revealed some startling findings relative to the lack of teacher training in integrating technology into the curriculum. In a national poll of over 1,400 teachers, 36 percent of teachers responded that they received absolutely no training in integrating technology in the curriculum; another 36 percent said they had only received 1 to 5 hours of such training; 14 percent received 6 to 10 hours of such training; and only 7 percent received between 11–20 hours.

In a very in-depth look at Michigan schools and technology several years ago, I learned that despite the utilization of education technology in a few localities, Michigan as a whole was below the national average in every measure of the use of technology in our schools. Michigan ranked 44 in teacher training in the use of technology. Ten percent of Michigan teachers reported that they had less than 9 hours of technology training. Michigan ranked 32 among the states in the ratio of students per computer. These findings propelled me in a direction that has resulted in a number of initiatives to turn Michigan around—to raise the State's use of education technology. I convened an Education Technology Summit that brought together over 400

business leaders, school administrators, school board members, foundation representatives, deans of Michigan's colleges of education and others to identify ways in which Michigan could excel in the area of Education technology.

Some key elements of the plan of action which followed that Education Technology Summit include the formation of a consortium that will establish the Nation's highest standards for training and certifying new teachers to use technology in the classroom and to integrate it into the curriculum. Beginning with the 1999–2000 academic year, the Consortium for Outstanding Achievement in Teaching with Technology {COATT} will award special credentials to new teachers who have demonstrated an exceptional ability to use information technology as a teaching tool. The legislation we are introducing today supports and complements this effort in Michigan. It will advance current efforts in my state to excel in education technology. And it will advance education technology across this Nation. Our legislation provides an incentive and a reward that will result in effectively equipping more and more teachers with the technology expertise they need to stimulate the interests of their students, raise student potential for learning, and increase student achievement. It has been a pleasure working with Senator CONRAD in fine tuning specific provisions of this legislation to more directly reflect the successful model we've created in my home state for giving special recognition to new teachers who are able to apply technology in classroom instruction.

I am pleased that the formation of COATT gives my state a head start in this direction. And, I am delighted that such an impressive slate of higher educational institutions from Michigan have signed on to the COATT initiative, including Albion College, Andrews University, Eastern Michigan University, Ferris State University, Lake Superior State University, Michigan State University, Oakland University, University of Detroit-Mercy, University of Michigan, University of Michigan-Dearborn, Wayne State University and Western Michigan University. New teachers with COATT credentials will have an advantage in the job market and school districts will benefit by knowing which applicants are qualified in using technology effectively in their instruction. The letter of agreement signed by each COATT member in committing their institutions to provide the resources to achieve the success of the COATT initiative is included at the end of my remarks. Michigan is already recognized as a leader in producing new teachers and if we set our minds to it, I'm convinced we can be one of the best in the nation when it

comes to teaching teachers how to integrate technology in the classroom and into the curriculum.

I'd like to mention yet another key effort I've led to advance Michigan's standing in education technology. It is the establishment of the Teach for Tomorrow Project (TFT), which provides on-line and in-person technology training, including credentials, to in-service teachers, who then return to their schools and teach other teachers what they have learned. By using technology to teach the technology, training can be accessed statewide and at a time and location which are convenient to the learners. Central Michigan University has approved the use of TFT materials as a professional development course eligible for graduate credit hours when done in conjunction with local onsite training. Under the legislation we are now introducing, teachers may also qualify for a bonus if they train and become certified to teach other teachers.

Finally, Mr. President, the legislation we are introducing creates an Information Technology Training initiative through which Federal matching grants would be awarded to partnerships between higher educational institutions, or a private organization or a business, which may include a commercial information technology training provider and information technology trade or professional association, to provide training and education to individuals who are under-represented in the information technology profession. Under-represented individuals would include, but not be limited to, such individuals as dislocated workers, veterans, students who have not completed their high school education, older Americans, women, individuals who have already received training but have not been certified, and others. The bill also authorizes \$100 million for this provision, which requires a 50 percent non-Federal match requirement that may be in the form of cash, equipment and/or in-kind services.

This legislation, The Information Technology Act, will be good for our schools. It will be good for the U.S. economy. I urge its speedy enactment. In closing, I would like to share with my colleagues the organizational endorsements of this legislation, which include: The National Education Association, Technology Workforce Coalition, Computing Technology Industry Association, American Society for Training and Development, Information Technology Training Association, Green Thumb, International Society for Technology in Education, American Association of University Women, Consortium for School Networking, and the Software Information Industry Association.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the COATT member agreement signed by higher education institutions in Michigan.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSORTIUM FOR OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT
IN TEACHING WITH TECHNOLOGY LETTER OF
AGREEMENT

We, the undersigned, commit our institutions to be members of the Consortium for Outstanding Achievement in Teaching with Technology (COATT). In doing so our institutions accept the following requirements.

(1) Each institution shall designate a faculty liaison to COATT. This person will participate in an annual review of the COATT standards and participate in periodic meetings with other core members of the COATT organization.

(2) Each institution shall designate a person to act as a point of contact within the institution for potential COATT candidates.

(3) Each institution shall promote COATT to potential candidates. This might occur through flyers, regular newsletters, publications, placement files, etc.

(4) Each institution shall provide adequate and relevant learning opportunities in the application of educational technology for students who wish to acquire COATT certification.

(5) Each institution shall provide adequate resources for COATT applicants to produce, maintain, and gain access to their COATT digital portfolios.

(6) Each institution shall be responsible for recommending and pre-certifying COATT applicants.

(7) Each institution shall involve its faculty and other qualified personnel in COATT evaluation teams.

By signing below, we understand that we are committing our institutions to provide the personnel resources, and opportunities described in the above seven points. We recognize that this level of commitment is crucial to the success of the COATT initiative.

Reuben Rubio, Director of the Ferguson Center for Technology-Aided Teaching, Albion College; Dr. Niels-Erik Andreasen, President, Andrews University; Dr. Jerry Robbins, Dean of the School of Education; Eastern Michigan University; Dr. Nancy Cooley, Dean of the College of Education, Ferris State University; Dr. David L. Toppen, Executive Vice President and Provost, Lake Superior State University; Dr. Carole Amers, Dean of the College of Education; Michigan State University; Dr. Jantes Clatworthy, Associate Dean of the School of Education and Human Resources, Oakland University; Aloha Van Camp, Acting Dean of the College of Education and Human Services, University of Detroit-Mercy; Dr. Karen Wixson, Dean of the School of Education, University of Michigan; Dr. Robert Simpson, Provost, University of Michigan-Dearborn; Dr. Paula Wood, Dean of the College of Education, Wayne State University; Dr. Alonzo Hannaford, Associate Dean of the College of Education, Western Michigan University.

By Mr. WELLSTONE:

S. 2348. A bill to provide for fairness and accuracy in student testing; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

FAIRNESS AND ACCURACY IN STUDENT TESTING
ACT

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, education is, among other things, a

process of shaping the moral imagination, character, skills and intellect of our children, of inviting them into the great conversation of our moral, cultural and intellectual life, and of giving them the resources to prepare to fully participate in the life of the nation and of the world.

But today in education there is a threat afoot to which I would like to call your attention: the threat of high-stakes testing being grossly abused in the name of greater accountability, and almost always to the serious detriment of our children.

Allowing the continued misuse of high-stakes tests is, in itself, a gross failure of moral imagination, a failure both of educators and of policymakers, who persistently refuse to provide the educational resources necessary to guarantee an equally rich educational experience for all our children. That all citizens will be given an equal start through a sound education is one of the most basic, promised rights of our democracy. Our chronic refusal as a nation to guarantee that right for all children, including poor children, is a national disgrace.

Today I am introducing legislation that would stem the growing trend of misusing high stakes tests. The legislation would require that states and districts use multiple measures of student performance in addition to standardized tests if they are going to use tests as part of a high stakes decision. The amendment will also require that if tests are used, they must be valid and reliable for the purposes for which they are used; must measure what the student was taught; and must provide appropriate accommodations for students with limited English proficiency and disabilities.

I would like to explain exactly why this bill would be so important and why I seek your support for it. If there is any question about whether or not we have, as a nation, overemphasized high stakes standardized testing, and if there is any question that this overemphasis has taken so much of the excitement out of teaching and learning for so many people across the country, I would like to open my remarks with some excerpts from a newspaper article from one of our state capitols earlier this year. The state is in the process of implementing high stakes tests for promotion. This article addresses how schools and students in the state are dealing with the preparation and stress of the pending high stakes test. The test, which lasts five days, will determine, among other things whether students will be promoted and whether schools will be sanctioned for poor performance.

The article describes one teacher who said, "I'm thinking about letting us have a scream day sometime in March, when we just go outside and scream," and it continues, "her principal . . . is

keenly aware of the stress on both students and teachers. He told teachers during a meeting . . . that he expects some students to throw up during the test. He arranged to have all of the school's janitors on duty to clean up any messes."

It is no wonder that students are stressed. According to the article, "For the past eight weeks, Northwestern's school billboard has been updated daily with the number of school days left until the test."

When I read this story, I wonder why we cannot let children be children? Why do we impose this misplaced pressure on children as young as eight years old? When I see what is happening around the country, with more and more states and districts adopting the harsh agenda of high stakes testing policies, I am struck by National Education Association President Bob Chase's comparison of all of these educational trends to the movie, "Field of Dreams." In my view, it is as though people are saying, "If we test them, they will perform." In too many places, testing, which is a critical part of systemic educational accountability, has ceased its purpose of measuring educational and school improvement and has become synonymous with it.

Making students accountable for test scores works well on a bumper sticker and it allows many politicians to look good by saying that they will not tolerate failure. But it represents a hollow promise. Far from improving education, high stakes testing marks a major retreat from fairness, from accuracy, from quality and from equity.

It is ironic, because standardized tests evolved historically as one way to ensure more equal opportunity in education. They are supposed to be an instrument of fairness because they are graded objectively and allow any person, regardless of background, to demonstrate their skill.

When used correctly, standardized tests are critical for diagnosing inequality and for identifying where we need improvement. They enable us to measure achievement across groups of students so that we can help ensure that states and districts are held accountable for improving the achievement of all students regardless of race, income, gender, limited English proficiency and disability. Tests are a critical tool, but, they are not a panacea.

The abuse of tests for high stakes purposes has subverted the benefits tests can bring. Using a single standardized test as the sole determinant for promotion, tracking, ability grouping and graduation is not fair and has not fostered greater equality or opportunity for students. First, standardized tests can not sufficiently validly or reliably assess what students know to make high stakes decisions about them.

The 1999 National Research Council report, "High Stakes," concludes that

"no single test score can be considered a definitive measure of a student's knowledge," and that "an educational decision that will have a major impact on a test taker should not be made solely or automatically on the basis of a single test score."

The "Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing," 1999 Edition, which has served as the standard for test developers and users for decades, asserts that: "In educational settings, a decision or a characterization that will have a major impact on a student should not be made on the basis of a single test score."

Even test publishers, including Harcourt Brace, CTB McGraw Hill, Riverside and ETS, consistently warn against this practice. For example, Riverside Publishing asserts in The "Interpretive Guide for School Administrators" for the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, "Many of the common misuses (of standardized tests) stem from depending on a single test score to make a decision about a student or class of students."

CTB McGraw Hill writes that "A variety of tests, or multiple measures, is necessary to tell educators what students know and can do . . . the multiple measures approach to assessment is the keystone to valid, reliable, fair information about student achievement."

There are many reasons tests cannot be relied upon as the sole determinant in making high stakes decisions about students. The National Research Council describes how these tests can be unreliable. The Council concludes that "a student's test score can be expected to vary across different versions of a test . . . as a function of the particular sample questions asked and/or transitory factors, such as the student's health on the day of the test. Thus, no single test score can be considered a definitive measure of a student's knowledge."

The research of David Rogosa at Stanford University shows how test scores are not valid, in isolation, to make judgements about individual achievement. His study of California's Stanford 9 National Percentile Rank Scores for individual students showed that the chances that a student whose true score is in the 50th percentile will receive a reported score that is within 5 percentage points of his true score are only 30% in reading and 42% on ninth grade math tests.

Rogosa also showed that on the Stanford 9 test "the chances, . . . that two students with identical "real achievement" will score more than 10 percentile points apart on the same test" is 57% for 9th graders and 42% on the fourth grade reading test. This margin of error shows why it would not be fair to use a cut-score in making a high stakes decision about a child.

Robert Rayborn, who directs Harcourt's Stanford 9 program in Cali-

fornia reenforced these findings when asked about the Stanford 9. He said, "They should never make high-stakes individual decisions with a single measure of any kind," including the Stanford 9.

Politicians and policy makers who continue to push for high stakes tests and educators who continue to use them in the face of this knowledge have closed their eyes to clearly set professional and scientific standards. They demand responsibility and high standards of students and schools while they let themselves get away with defying the most basic standards of the education profession.

It would be irresponsible if a parent or a teacher used a manufactured product on children in a way that the manufacturer says is unsafe. Why do we then honor and declare "accountable" policy makers and politicians who use tests on children in a way that the test manufacturers have said is effectively unsafe?

There is no doubt that when mistakes are made, the consequences are devastating. The bad effects of retention in grade have been clearly established in science. Study after study shows that retention leads to poorer academic performance, higher dropout rates, increased behavioral problems, low self-esteem and higher rates of criminal activity and suicide. Research on high school dropouts indicates that students who do not graduate are more likely to be unemployed or hold positions with little or no career advancement, earn lower wages and be on public assistance.

On a more immediate level, many of my colleagues will remember how 8,600 students were mistakenly held in summer school because their tests were graded incorrectly.

When we talk about responsibility, what could be more irresponsible than using an invalid or unreliable measure as the sole determinant of something so important as high school graduation or in-school promotion?

The effects of high stakes testing go beyond their impact on individual students to greatly impact the educational process in general. They have had a deadening effect on learning.

Again, research proves this point. Studies indicate that public testing encourages teachers and administrators to focus instruction on test content, test format and test preparation. Teachers tend to overemphasize the basic skills, and underemphasize problem-solving and complex thinking skills that are not well assessed on standardized tests. Further, they neglect content areas that are not covered such as science, social studies and the arts.

For example, in Chicago, the Consortium on Chicago School Research concluded that "Chicago's regular year and summer school curricula were so

closely geared to the Iowa test that it was impossible to distinguish real subject matter mastery from mastery of skills and knowledge useful for passing this particular test." These findings are backed up by a recent poll in Texas which showed that only 27% of teachers in Texas felt that increased test scores reflected increased learning and higher quality teaching. 85% of teachers said that they neglected subjects not covered by the TAAS exam.

Stories are emerging from around the country about schools where teachers and students are under such pressure to perform that schools actually use limited funds to pay private companies to coach students and teachers in test taking strategies. According to the "San Jose Mercury News," schools in East Palo Alto, which is one of the poorest districts in California, paid Stanley Kaplan \$10,000 each to consult with them on test taking strategies. According to the same article, "schools across California are spending thousands to buy computer programs, hire consultants, and purchase workbooks and materials. They're redesigning spelling tests and math lessons, all in an effort to help students become better test takers." The teacher from the article I mentioned before had even bought blank score sheets with bubbles on them so students can practice filling in circles.

The richness and exploration we want our own children to experience is being sucked out of our schools. I was moved by an op-ed I read recently in the New York Times. It was written by a fifth grade teacher, who obviously had a great passion for his work. He said, "But as I teach from day to day . . . I no longer see the students in the way I once did—certainly not in the same exuberant light as when I first started teaching five years ago. Where once they were 'challenging' or 'marginal' students, I am now beginning to see 'liabilities.' Where once there was a student of 'limited promise,' there is now an inescapable deficit that all available efforts will only nominally affect." Children are measured by their score, not their potential, not their diverse talents, not the depth of their knowledge and not their character.

It has been clearly established through research that high stakes tests for individual students, when used in isolation, are fatally flawed. I would, however, also like to address a general issue that this bill does not address directly, but that I think is really what all of this is about in the end. The trend towards high stakes testing represents a harsh agenda that holds children responsible for our own failure to invest in their future and in their achievement. I firmly believe that it is grossly unfair, for example, to hold back a student based on a standardized test if that student has not had the opportunity to learn the material covered

on the test. When we impose high stakes tests on an educational system where there are, as Jonathan Kozol says, "savage inequalities," and then we do nothing to address the underlying causes of those inequalities, we set up children to fail.

People talk about using tests to motivate students to do well and using tests to ensure that we close the achievement gap. This kind of talk is backwards and unfair. We cannot close the achievement gap until we close the gap in investment between poor and rich schools no matter how "motivated" some students are. We know what these key investments are: quality teaching, parental involvement, and early childhood education, to name just a few.

But instead of doing what we know will work, and instead of taking responsibility as policy makers to invest in improving students' lives, we place the responsibility squarely on children. It is simply negligent to force children to pass a test and expect that the poorest children, who face every disadvantage, will be able to do as well as those who have every advantage.

When we do this, we hold children responsible for our own inaction and unwillingness to live up to our own promises and our own obligations. We confuse their failure with our own. This is a harsh agenda indeed, for America's children.

All of us in politics like to get our picture taken with children. We never miss a "photo op." We all like to say that "children are our future." We are all for children until it comes time to make the investment. Too often, despite the talk, when it comes to making the investment in the lives of our children, we come up a dollar short.

Noted civil rights activist Fannie Lou Hamer used to say, "I'm sick and tired of being sick and tired." Well I'm sick and tired of symbolic politics. When we say we are for children, we ought to be committed to invest in the health, skills and intellect of our children. We are not going to achieve our goals on a tin cup budget. Unless we make a real commitment, unless we put our money where our mouth is, children will continue to fail.

If one does not believe that failure on tests has to do with this crushing lack of opportunity, look at who is failing. In Minnesota, in the first round of testing, 79% of low income students failed the reading portion of the high school exit exam and 74% failed the math part. It is unconscionable.

We must never stop demanding that children do their best. We must never stop holding schools accountable. Measures of student performance can include standardized tests, but only when coupled with other measures of achievement, more substantive education reforms and a much fuller, sustained investment in schools.

When we use high stakes tests as the sole determinant in making decisions about students, we get the sequence backwards. We lose sight of our fundamental objective—to provide children with the tools they need to achieve, to think critically and to understand deeply the material they need to meet high standards. We cannot get away with making children pay for our failure to provide them with the high quality education they need, deserve and is their right.

Gunnar Myrdal said that ignorance is never random. If we ignore what science tells us, if we close our eyes to the impact of high stakes tests, we can continue as we are now—sounding good while doing bad. The Fairness and Accuracy in Student Testing Act would be a strong step in the the right direction—toward fairness and equity and accuracy and a love of learning that will last children their lifetimes.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 2349. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to permit States with proven cost-effective and efficient child support collection systems to continue to operate such systems; to the Committee on Finance.

CHILD SUPPORT COLLECTION SYSTEMS LEGISLATION

• Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation with my colleague Senator THOMAS that would give a small amount of States the flexibility to operate their locally-run child support systems. Wyoming's Parental Obligation System for Support Enforcement [POSSE] fulfills the federal requirements for effective child support collections and disbursement. For example, Wyoming has increased child support collections by 140 percent since establishing its federally mandated automated network in 1995. Comparatively, the increase of child support collections nationwide since 1995 is only 49 percent. POSSE has proven to be the most cost-effective and efficient way to assist Wyoming's children and families.

However, a provision was included in the 1996 welfare reform law that requires States to establish a single address for the collection and disbursement of all wage-withholding child support payments. Although the intent was to relieve employers of burdensome redtape, the welfare reform law does not allow employers to continue submitting payments locally. My State's children and families and the business community benefit from the local system due to the convenience factor for its participants. Most importantly, POSSE is already achieving the desired results with the current local system in place. Clearly, this single address requirement is a one-size-fits-all solution to a problem that does not accommodate Wyoming.

The bill we are introducing today would amend Part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to permit States with proven cost-effective and efficient child support collection systems to continue to operate such systems. States can continue to operate their current systems if they meet the following criteria: the State has established an automated data tracking system; the State allows employers to send all wage withholding payments to a single address; and, the State provides data on a quarterly basis that demonstrates under the current system, for the most recent four fiscal year quarters, that at least 90 percent of all child support obligations paid are disbursed within two business days after receipt. My home State of Wyoming effectively and consistently meets these criteria.

The legislation we are introducing today would give States more flexibility to operate their local system; however, States must adhere to federal performance standards in order to maintain State and local flexibility. As Senator THOMAS stated, what works for one state does not necessarily yield the same results in another. Wyoming's system works.●

● Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation with my colleague Senator ENZI that would allow states to continue to operate their locally run child support systems. Since establishing its federally mandated automated network in 1995, the State of Wyoming has increased child support collections by 140 percent. Over 98 percent of the payments are processed within 2 days. Not only does Wyoming measure up to the Federal requirements for effective child support collections and disbursement, it far exceeds the bar. Under the award-winning Parental Obligation System for Support Enforcement [POSSE], which is administered by the Clerks of the District Court, the clear winners are Wyoming's children and families.

Unfortunately, that stands to change. Due to a provision of the 1996 welfare reform law, states are required to establish a single address for the collection and disbursement of all wage-withholding child support payments. The intent of the law was to relieve employers from mailing payments to numerous locations, as part of a greater effort to improve child support collections across the nation. While these goals are certainly laudable, the law does not allow employers to continue submitting payments locally, even if it is more convenient for them to do so, and even if a state's localized system is already achieving the desired results. Ultimately, states are being forced to make changes to correct a problem they may not have, and they could end up creating new ones along the way.

Simply put, the legislation we are introducing today would give states the

flexibility to operate their local systems—as long as they continue to meet federal performance standards. One size does not fit all. Methods that work well in Chicago, Illinois do not necessarily yield the same results in Chugwater, Wyoming. In this case, the results in Wyoming speak for themselves.

I look forward to working with the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee to pass this important measure.●

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 2350. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to certain water rights to Duchesne City, Utah; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

DUCHESNE CITY WATER RIGHTS CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Duchesne City Water Rights Conveyance Act. This bill will resolve an issue, nearly a century old, that has kept the city of Duchesne, Utah, from obtaining title to water rights that have been reserved for the city's use. The solution I propose is simple and long overdue. It is the result of careful negotiations between the city and the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation. I congratulate both these parties for coming together to resolve this issue.

In 1905, the city of Duchesne, Utah was established when the Secretary of Interior directed the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to select certain tracts of land in the Uintah Indian Reservation for the town site. At the time, the acting Indian Agent for the Uintah Indian Reservation filed applications to appropriate water to the municipal and domestic uses. The U.S. Indian Service was designated as the holder of these of three water rights.

Mr. President, for many years, efforts have been made to clear the title to these water rights in the name of Duchesne City, but these efforts have been unsuccessful, because the U.S. Indian Service no longer exists. The extinction of the U.S. Indian Service has created a legal anomaly, making it impossible to transfer the water rights of Duchesne.

The water in question has always been used by Duchesne, and neither the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Department of the Interior, nor the Ute Indian Tribe claims any right in the use of this water. In fact they are supportive of this legislation which ties up a legal loose end a manner agreed with upon both Indian Tribe and the city of Duchesne.

Mr. President, I thank the Senate for the opportunity to address this issue this today, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 2351. A bill to provide for the settlement of the water rights claims of the Shivwits Band of the Paiute Indian tribe of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

SHIVWITS BAND OF THE PAIUTE INDIAN TRIBE OF UTAH WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise today, along with my colleague, Senator BENNETT to introduce the Shivwits Band of the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah Water Rights Settlement Act, which will finally provide a settlement of water rights issues of the Santa Clara River in Washington County, Utah. This settlement is an important piece of the Virgin River Adjudication, which was initiated by the State of Utah in July of 1980.

To understand the consequence of this bill, Mr. President, it is important to keep in mind that Washington County is the driest county in Utah, and Utah is the second driest state in the Union. The Santa Clara river is a fairly small river which runs through the Shivwits Band's reservation near the city of St. George, Utah. This water must be shared by the Washington County Water Conservancy District, the city of St. George, the town of Ivins, the town of Santa Clara, and the Shivwits Band, and an endangered fish species. Needless to say, finding a settlement on the use of this water was not simple, but it has been achieved. I would like to publicly praise all the parties that came together and put the agreement together.

One of the benefits of this legislation is the St. George Water Reuse Project. This project will provide 2,000 acre-feet of treated water for the Shivwits Band. This settlement will also establish the Santa Clara Project. This project will provide a pressurized pipeline from the nearby Gunlock Reservoir and will deliver a total of 1,900 acre-feet of water to the Shivwits Band.

Mr. President, the project will also provide that sufficient water remains in the Santa Clara river for the survival of the Virgin Spinedace, an endangered fish species. In addition, the Secretary of Interior will be authorized to establish a program to purchase water rights and habitat in the Virgin River Basin for fish and other species.

As you can see, Mr. President, this agreement provides an excellent balance between the needs of the cities, the Shivwits Band, and the environment. It is no wonder that this legislation has the support of all interested parties. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to give this proposal their full support.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

S. 2352. A bill to designate portions of the Wekiva River and associated tributaries as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

WEKIVA WILD AND SCENIC DESIGNATION ACT

• Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, thank you for allowing me this opportunity to introduce legislation affecting the Wekiva River, which is located east central Florida.

With millions of people moving to Florida every year and the resulting urban sprawl, we must work to preserve our state's natural treasures. The Wekiva River is worthy of our protective efforts.

The Wekiva River and the Wekiva River Basin are unique and important river habitats because of their outstanding scenic, recreational, fishery, wildlife, historic, cultural, and water quality values. The Wekiva River Basin is home to many species of wildlife including Florida black bears, sandhill cranes, turkeys, and burrowing owls. Fossils of prehistoric mammals, such as saber tooth cats, mastodons, and giant sloths, have been found along the length of the river.

Generations of Floridians and Florida visitors have enjoyed the beauty and tranquility of the Wekiva River. It is a popular spot for canoeing, camping, hiking, and trail biking because of its intrinsic beauty and quintessential Florida appeal.

The legislation I introduce today will declare the Wekiva River a Wild and Scenic River and preserve it for the future enjoyment of Floridians and visitors to Florida. Today, the House Resources Committee, National Parks and Public Land Subcommittee will hold a hearing on this bill. Mr. President, I hope that we will move forward soon in the Senate.●

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. INOUE, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Ms. JOHNSON, and Mr. STEVENS):

S. 2353. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the program for American Indian Tribal Colleges and Universities under part A of title III; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

LEGISLATIVE FIX FOR TRIBAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AND ALASKA NATIVE AND NATIVE HAWAIIAN SERVING INSTITUTIONS

• Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a bill that represents a simple, straightforward correction of an inequity that is negatively impacting some of this country's most underfunded institutions of higher education. These include Tribal Colleges and Universities and Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions.

Many of these institutions apply for Institutional Aid under Title III of the Higher Education Act. Title III provides grants to a specific set of colleges and universities that serve disproportionate numbers of minority, low-income, and first generation college students.

These institutions have considerable impact on improving the quality and quantity of educational and career op-

portunities for their students, who face unique socio-economic barriers. Title III was created to help improve and expand the academic capacity of institutions specifically established and committed to serving these students.

In 1998, Part A of Title III, the Strengthening Developing Institutions Program, was amended by the Higher Education Amendments to introduce a special program for Tribal Colleges and Universities and for Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions. This was a positive step in recognizing the needs of these distinctive institutions and the populations that they serve.

However, the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 also instituted a change that requires grantees to "wait out" for at least two years at the end of their grant before applying for a new grant. This wait out period was originally created to ensure that Title II funding would reach the maximum number of students and institutions as possible.

The provision applied to all Title II grantees with the exception of Historical Black Colleges and Universities, which receive formula funding under the title. Before the higher education reauthorization became law, Hispanic Serving Institutions were transferred to a new title so that the wait out period no longer applied to them.

Therefore, as signed into law, the wait out only affects Sections 316 and 317, which cover Tribal Colleges and Universities and Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions. In my State of Hawaii, this involves the major college campuses and community colleges in the University of Hawaii system, which essentially affects the entire State.

This bill, which I am introducing along with my colleagues—Senators INOUE, MURKOWSKI, JOHNSON and STEVENS—would make a technical change exempting Sections 316 and 317 from the harmful two-year wait out requirement. Similar legislation, H.R. 3629, was introduced in the House of Representatives on February 10th of this year.

This legislation must be passed immediately because any delay in continued assistance can prove critical for any college or university serving small, disadvantaged, populations.

Furthermore, because the applicant pool for Title III, Part A, assistance is already so limited in size, the failure to exempt institutions from the two-year wait out provision will likely result in no institutions being eligible to apply for future funds under this program. We must not allow this unnecessary scenario to come about. Currently, there are six institutions in the states of Washington, Montana, California, North Dakota, and South Dakota that are currently stuck in the first year of their two-year wait out period.

This non-controversial correction has broad support in the higher education community and obviously from the institutions that will be negatively affected. I strongly urge that my colleagues join me in pushing this simple change forward to correct a problem that, if unaddressed, will have adverse impacts on Tribal Colleges and Universities and Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions, and the students that they serve.●

By Mr. ROTH (for himself and Mr. MOYNIHAN):

S. 2354. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent the duplication of losses through the assumption of liabilities giving rise to a deduction; to the Committee on Finance.

REVISED REVENUE PROVISION FOR THE TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce—along with Senator MOYNIHAN—a bill that will clarify a revenue provision that has been reserved for the Trade and Development Act of 1999.

Last fall, the Senate Finance Committee reserved from the Tax Relief Extension Act of 1999 a revenue provision regarding the prevention or duplication of loss through assumption of liabilities, for inclusion in the Trade and Development Act of 1999. This revenue provision addresses a tax-avoidance transaction in which the assumption of certain liabilities or potential liabilities may permit the acceleration or duplication of a loss attributable to those liabilities. The bill that Senator MOYNIHAN and I introduce more precisely defines the types of transactions that are excepted from this revenue provision. Our bill is offered as a substitute for last fall's provision, and we introduce it today seeking public comment.

By Mr. SANTORUM:

S. 2355. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to modify authorizations of appropriations for programs under such act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

THE GROWING RESOURCES IN EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT FOR TODAY AND TOMORROW ACT

• Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, today, I am introducing legislation to dramatically increase funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA). My legislation would more than double the federal commitment to IDEA funding within four years. The legislation, "Growing Resources in Educational Achievement for Today and Tomorrow" (GREAT IDEA) will take significant steps toward fulfilling the federal commitment to IDEA funding. The legislation will also free up additional funds for local school districts to be spent on their highest priorities, whether it be teacher training or salaries, reducing class sizes, school

construction, library resources, technology, or music and arts education. The legislation is supported by the Pennsylvania School Boards Association and Pennsylvania Governor Tom Ridge who chairs the education committee of the National Governor's Association.

Every child is deserving of a high-quality education in an environment that encourages them to learn and grow to the best of their ability. Thanks to IDEA, many students are learning and achieving at levels previously thought impossible, graduating from high school, going to college and entering the workforce as productive citizens. We must encourage this progress and continue to give parents and teachers the resources they need to create opportunities for special children. By boldly increasing the IDEA funding level, we can keep more students in schools and help them achieve new measures of success.

Prior to IDEA's implementation in 1975, approximately 1 million children with disabilities were shut out of schools and hundreds of thousands more were denied appropriate services. Since then, IDEA has helped change the lives of these children. Congress had originally committed to cover 40 percent of IDEA's costs when it passed the original IDEA bill in 1975, with the remaining balance to be met by local communities and states. Over the years, however, while the law itself continues to work and children are being educated, the intended cost-sharing partnership has not been realized. The federal commitment of 40 percent will be reached within eight years if the funding stream established in GREAT IDEA is sustained. This is my first priority in helping local school districts provide the best education possible for elementary and secondary education.

I urge my colleagues to support this effort to double funding for IDEA within the next four years as we continue to work to fulfill this long neglected federal commitment and free up educational resources for local education. This legislation will fully fund more than 700,000 additional IDEA students at an average cost of \$13,860 per student. We must accelerate the progress we have made by passing and funding this legislation.●

By Mr. LUGAR (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 2356. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve management of the child and adult care food program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

CHILD AND ADULT CARE FOOD PROGRAM
MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2000

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill to restore confidence in the Child and Adult Care

Food Program (CACFP) by attacking fraud and abuse discovered in the operation of the program.

Last year, the Inspector General of the United States Department of Agriculture released an audit of the CACFP, a nutrition program that reimburses the cost of meals at adult day care centers, child care centers and family day care homes. The IG's audit detailed extensive abuse of program funds by sponsor organizations. Sponsors are responsible for substantial monitoring and oversight of providers. In addition to the oversight function, the sponsors verify and forward CACFP claims to the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) of the USDA and receive and distribute payments to providers. For their efforts, sponsors retain a portion of the reimbursement to large child care centers and are paid a flat administrative fee for each small day care home under their auspices. The Inspector General's findings were critical of both the FNS management of the program as well as the structure of CACFP that gives wide responsibility as well as the control of finances to sponsor organizations.

The results of the audit are staggering. The IG found in "Operation Kiddie Care" that 37 of 49 sponsors investigated were seriously deficient in program administration. Of the 37 sponsors, 16 have ultimately been terminated from the program. These 16 sponsors were receiving about \$35 million annually. Forty-four people have been indicted or named in criminal documents for defrauding CACFP and twenty-eight of these individuals have pled guilty or have been convicted.

The IG concluded that the structure of CACFP is flawed. The program creates pools of money that invite abuse; sponsors of centers are able to retain up to 30 percent of program funds. The program encourages sponsors to ignore provider deficiencies since sponsors' administrative cost reimbursement is based on the number of providers they administer and the providers' reimbursement is based on the number of meals served. In addition, sponsor officials may increase their salaries by reducing funds for day care monitoring activities.

USDA has prepared this legislation to address the IG's concerns and conclusion. This bill will enable state agencies to deny the application of any sponsor that is found to be seriously deficient in any publicly-funded program, unlike current law which looks only at nutrition programs. For example, if the sponsor also runs a Head Start center and is not meeting Head Start management rules, that finding can disqualify the organization from participation in CACFP. The proposal will require organizations to have tax-exempt status from the Internal Revenue Service and will limit the amount a sponsor can withhold from child care

centers. Public agencies (e.g., local health departments and schools) will be encouraged to participate as sponsors through reduced administrative requirements.

State agencies will have the ability to temporarily suspend payments without a hearing for up to 90 days. States will also be allowed to retain one-half of the funds collected through audits and state reviews. The FNS will also receive one-eighth of one percent of program funds to provide oversight which will generate \$3 million annually compared to \$1 million received under current law. Finally, FNS will be required to study the administrative payment structure.

While I am not certain that I will support all the provisions in USDA's bill, I am introducing it today to begin the process of discussing and refining it. I encourage all interested parties to contact the Agriculture Committee with their comments and suggestions.

Mr. President, the Federal government's nutrition programs are vitally important to millions of Americans. We cannot allow fraud and abuse of these programs to waste taxpayer dollars and undermine support for these crucial programs.●

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to have this opportunity to join my colleague, the distinguished Chairman of the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee, Senator LUGAR, to introduce this legislation designed to address the fraud and abuse that has been found to be all too common in the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP). It is intolerable that bad actors have tarnished the image of this important and laudable program of nutrition assistance. We need to move aggressively to pass legislation to make the necessary changes to root out fraud and abuse while maintaining CACFP's effectiveness and restoring its integrity.

Finding quality day care is one of the most difficult problems facing working families today. CACFP is a very good program that helps meet that need. The program, which is administered through the Food and Nutrition Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, reimburses the costs of meals and snacks at family day care homes, child care centers and adult day care homes. Because of the important role CACFP serves, Congress expanded it modestly in 1998 to help support after-school activities for older children. In fiscal 1999, some 2.6 million children were served on average each day through CACFP, with the total cost of the program amounting to about \$1.6 billion.

It is my understanding that USDA's Food and Nutrition Service recognized that there were problems in the operation of CACFP and asked USDA's Inspector General to audit the program. Simply put, the results of the audit cry

out for action. In an audit covering nearly three years, the IG found 37 sponsors in 23 states have had serious problems in carrying out CACFP. There were at least 30 criminal investigations and more than 40 individuals charged with defrauding CACFP. Notably, the IG found that the Department of Agriculture and the States should have done more to prevent the fraud and abuse that was prevalent in the program. Also the IG found structural problems in CACFP itself that make the program more susceptible to fraud and abuse.

The legislation Senator LUGAR and I are introducing today has been drafted by USDA to respond to the problems and shortcomings in CACFP identified by the IG. There are a number of good provisions and ideas in this legislation. I do not necessarily endorse all of the specific aspects of this bill, but it is a strong and thoughtful starting point for further consideration and for urgently-needed legislative action to address problems in CACFP that cannot be allowed to continue.

I echo the remarks of my colleague, Senator LUGAR, on the importance of the Federal nutrition programs and the need to combat fraud and abuse, so that we can prevent the waste of taxpayer dollars and maintain support for the programs. There is no inconsistency in strongly supporting child nutrition programs, yet vigorously fighting fraud and abuse in those programs. The truth of the matter is that every dollar siphoned off to fraud and abuse is a dollar that could better be spent improving the nutrition of our nation's children.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 92

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 92, a bill to provide for biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 285

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 285, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restore the link between the maximum amount of earnings by blind individuals permitted without demonstrating ability to engage in substantial gainful activity and the exempt amount permitted in determining excess earnings under the earnings test.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 311, a bill to authorize the Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation

to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs, and for other purposes.

S. 660

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 660, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under part B of the medicare program of medical nutrition therapy services furnished by registered dietitians and nutrition professionals.

S. 717

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 717, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the reductions in social security benefits which are required in the case of spouses and surviving spouses who are also receiving certain Government pensions shall be equal to the amount by which two-thirds of the total amount of the combined monthly benefit (before reduction) and monthly pension exceeds \$1,200, adjusted for inflation.

S. 915

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 915, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand and make permanent the medicare subvention demonstration project for military retirees and dependents

S. 916

At the request of Mr. GRAMS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 916, a bill to amend the Agricultural Market Transition Act to repeal the Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact provision.

S. 1020

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 1020, a bill to amend chapter 1 of title 9, United States Code, to provide for greater fairness in the arbitration process relating to motor vehicle franchise contracts.

S. 1074

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1074, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to waive the 24-month waiting period for medicare coverage of individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), and to provide medicare coverage of drugs and biologicals used for the treatment of ALS or for the alleviation of symptoms relating to ALS.

S. 1133

At the request of Mr. GRAMS, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1133, a bill to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to cover birds of the order Ratitae that are raised for use as human food.

S. 1272

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1272, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to promote pain management and palliative care without permitting assisted suicide and euthanasia, and for other purposes.

S. 1361

At the request of Mr. STEVENS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1361, a bill to amend the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 to provide for an expanded Federal program of hazard mitigation, relief, and insurance against the risk of catastrophic natural disasters, such as hurricanes, earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions, and for other purposes.

S. 1384

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1384, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a national folic acid education program to prevent birth defects, and for other purposes.

S. 1805

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) were added as cosponsors of S. 1805, a bill to restore food stamp benefits for aliens, to provide States with flexibility in administering the food stamp vehicle allowance, to index the excess shelter expense deduction to inflation, to authorize additional appropriations to purchase and make available additional commodities under the emergency food assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 1810

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1810, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify and improve veterans' claims and appellate procedures.

S. 1874

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1874, a bill to improve academic and social outcomes for youth and reduce both juvenile crime and the risk that youth will become victims of crime by providing productive activities conducted by law enforcement personnel during non-school hours.

S. 1900

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAU), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS)